

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 473

EA 016 036

AUTHOR Foster, William
TITLE Leadership as Praxis: Issues in Administration.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Principles; *Educational Administration; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; Models; *Organizational Theories; Politics of Education

ABSTRACT

Identifying the assumptions of the dominant, functionalist paradigm in considerations of educational administration as inadequate, this study proposes an alternative paradigm: a politics of schooling that can both describe administration and organization and contribute to the development of leadership as praxis. Criteria for an adequate theory of educational administration are explanatory, social, and critical. However, orthodox theoretical models of administration, organization, and leadership fail to address these criteria adequately and have the managerial and rationalistic bias of the functionalist paradigm. Alternatively, a politics of schooling embodying a radical perspective may be theoretically adequate, rich, and critically aware. Two major research directions can contribute to the understanding of organization, administration, and leadership within the context of a political economy: theoretically based ethnographies of schools and the development of biographical accounts of school administrators. The study suggests that administrators will learn more from a social theory that stresses the critical impact of the school in creating our society than from research based on some behavioral science model. (PB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William P.
Foster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Leadership as Praxis: Issues in Administration

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting,
American Educational Research Assoc.,
Montreal. April, 1983.

William Foster
University of San Diego

ED233473

EA 016 036

Introduction

This paper attempts to provide the following analysis: as a discipline reliant on the social sciences, educational administration reflects a theoretical orientation based on a functionalist paradigm which fails to meet the criteria of being explanatory, social and critical. As a discipline, educational administration is also based on a theory of organizations which has a managerial and rationalistic bias. It is then argued that a more appropriate way to consider administration is in relation to a politics of schooling, in particular, a radicalized political economy model. Adopting this perspective may allow us to investigate the concept of leadership as transformative activity, i.e., as praxis. While there is no definitive theory in this area, possible research strategies within the political approach could involve developing ethnographies and biographies which may help us understand more fully organizations and leadership.

Educational Administration as Social Science

Although there is some dispute as to whether training in administrative theory has any bearing on the practice of administration in schools, it could be claimed that such training sets to establish the theoretical framework or paradigm that practitioners take with them into the practice of their profession. While administrators may, and do, claim that the "theory" they receive ill prepares them for handling the myriad duties and details of everyday schooling, it nevertheless provides an orientation, a way of thinking, about

the process. There is a connection, in this instance, between theory and practice, albeit an often loose one.

If the connection is indeed quite loose, the fault may not lie with the practice, nor with the practitioners' inability to grasp and translate into specific circumstance the demands of theory. Indeed, the paradigm within which theory and research is developed may be bankrupt.

Theory in administration is at its heart dependent on other social science disciplines (Boyan, 1981) and orthodox theory on the standard models in these disciplines. As such, orthodox theory suffers from a number of the problems around which discussion in the social sciences has recently focused. Theory in administration operates within a particular paradigm which has encompassed much of social science generally and which promulgates a world view both of science and society. This is what Burrell and Morgan (1979) dub the "functionalist paradigm" for sociological analyses. Morgan (1980:608) describes this paradigm clearly:

(it) is based upon the assumption that society has a concrete, real existence, and a systemic character oriented to produce an ordered and regulated state of affairs. It encourages an approach to social theory that focuses upon understanding the role of human beings in society. Behavior is always seen as being contextually bound in a real world of concrete and tangible social relationships. The ontological assumptions encourage a belief in the possibility of an objective and value-free social science in which the scientist is distanced from the scene which he or she is analyzing through the rigor and technique of the scientific method. The functionalist perspective is primarily regulative and programmatic in its basic orientation, concerned with understanding society in a way which generates useful empirical knowledge.

The functionalist paradigm, in effect, reflects an objectivistic and empiricist program of research. If this program is useful in explaining social, educational and political issues, we won't argue with it. There is, however, some concern that it isn't. At the social level, the paradigm seems inadequate.

Yet this paradigm remains the dominant perspective taken by administrative theoreticians. As it is discussed in several of the major texts (Owens, 1981; Hoy and Miskel 1982; Sergiovanni and Carver, 1980) the history of administrative thought is presented as an abstracted empiricism, separated largely from the cultural realities of practicing administrators, cloaked in the language of "behavioral science" and reflecting a positive and optimistic appraisal of the role of educational research in solving policy problems.

Educational administration is often presented in historical-specific terms, that is, as a field whose genesis is particularly modern and dependent on empirical studies of schooling. Thus, the history of (educational) administrative theory is shown as beginning with Taylor's strictures concerning management, brought up through the human relations era and Barnard's corporate wisdom and into contemporary behavioral science. Theory is identified more or less solely with the abstracted empirical accounts fostered by an awesome respect for natural science methods. An optimism prevails: the field is yet young and further research will yield more conclusive results. "The current situation of educational administration," write Hoy and Miskel (1982:17), "is analogous to the position of sociology during the last decade of the nineteenth century

in France." "Educational administration," they continue (27), "is a new field, and that is the first source of difficulty. Only in the twentieth century has the discipline become a systematic field of study." While admitting an absence of systematic principles, many theorists in the functionalist paradigm simply call for more of the same kind of research. Hoy and Miskel (1982: 28), for example, say that "the road to generalized knowledge can lie only in tough-minded scientific research, not introspection and subjective experience." This orientation, which has been challenged on other terms in recent years, is lacking in several respects.

For one, there is an assumption here that administration is a particularly modern and a particularly American invention. Giddens, however, (1979: 241), critical of the received notion that sociology itself is but a child, notes that "social science is as old as natural science is; both can be dated back to the post-Renaissance period in Europe, as recognizably 'modern' in form." If not on quite so grand a scale, I suspect that educational administration has been with us, in a generic form, for quite a while prior to Cubberley's notations on the subject. What is particularly contemporary, however, is a theoretical framework based on a functionalist model and a research framework emulative of the natural sciences (see Simon's Appendix in Administrative Behavior, 1965, for an unusually clear presentation of the assumptions of an administrative "science".) This approach to administration leads to a mistaken conception regarding the foundations of the social and the natural sciences. Whereas in the natural sciences it may be seen that laws are universal in form, predicting behavior under given conditions, there is reason to believe that is not so within the social sciences. Giddens (1979:243) goes so far as to suggest:

Laws in the social sciences are historical in character and in principle mutable in form.

All forms of regularised social conduct... can be analysed as involving typical sets of connections between the unacknowledged conditions of action, the rationalization of action in the context of it's purposive reflexive monitoring, and the unintended consequences of action.

Indeed, a basic difference is that the so-called objects of social science research have knowledge of themselves as objects and as subjects of the research. To ignore this fundamental difference, (as one might do when collecting aggregate data to discover the "causes" of, say, positive school climate) is to disallow any theory of constructive action for the actors in the situation, as several social commentators, (in particular, Giddens, 1979) have observed. A theory of action, in turn, reflects a theory of culture: that is, that individuals actively construct their life worlds and both receive yet modify culture.

These problems with orthodox theory in administration have engendered in the last few years a number of self-critical reflections by the doyens of administration but have not appreciably changed the nature of theorizing. The issues and controversies surrounding the "theory debate" in educational administration have been documented elsewhere; suffice it to say that largely in response to Greenfield's work (starting with his 1974 Bristol address), where he rejected much of the normal theorizing in favor of what has been labeled a phenomenological approach (but, it seems to me, might more accurately be called an existentialist position), theorists have talked about "intellectual turmoil" (Griffiths, 1979), broken ikons (Halpin and Hayes, 1977), and the need for a redesigned research program (Erickson, 1979). Yet, while Bridges (1982:25) finds that "there is no compelling evidence to suggest that a major theoretical issue or practical problem

relating to school administrators has been resolved by those toiling in the intellectual vineyards since 1967," researchers, such as Hoy (1982:9), who concludes only that better research methods are warranted, or Willower (1979 a,b) who sees departures from the orthodox theory as being mere ideological gestures, tend to maintain a basic functionalist orientation, well within the bounds of that paradigm.

For many theorists, developments critical of orthodox theory (e.g., neo-Marxian approaches, phenomenology, "new" sociology, etc.) and developments within orthodox theory (e.g., loose coupling, organized anarchies, social models) are discomfiting because they do challenge some of the basic premises of the major framework within which administrative theorists have been working. These premises underlie orthodox research into the nature of administration and organization and, in particular, into the nature of leadership. We hope to analyze these issues in orthodox theory by taking a critical stance itself located in an alternate paradigm, namely, a radicalized political economy framework which allows for a somewhat revised definition of the nature of leadership. This approach, we feel, has both policy implications and research possibilities which satisfy more fully the requirements for an adequate social science. Any social science, if it is to serve us and not us it, need satisfy certain criteria. Research based in the functionalist paradigm, it would seem, has certain logical difficulties which, in turn, lead to its inability to satisfy certain criteria to be discussed.

Some Criteria for Adequate Theory

"Why," ask Ericson and Ellett (1981:497), "has educational research had so few implications for education policy?" In answering their own question, they find that the "empiricist program" (i.e., a functionalist paradigm with so-called "objective," data-based research modeled on the natural sciences and concerned with predictive laws) has failed to produce any conclusions beyond the trivial. More than this, the empiricist tradition is faulted both methodologically, for its inability to supply causal chains, and logically. In the latter case, they claim that any examination of human behavior requires interpretation; that, indeed, empirically-based social research itself requires interpretative understanding. This is so in part because of the different logics of language use: in natural science research, the language of description is separated from the object of inquiry; in social research, however, "the language is partly constitutive of our educational and social practices and is essential to their existence" (Ericson and Ellett, 1982:508).

What Ericson and Ellett are concerned with here is the notion of hermeneutics as developed by Dilthey and currently practiced by Gadamer (1975) and Apel (1967). Here, the inter-subjective nature of knowledge and of understanding is stressed and, while major philosophical differences exist between these authors, they do share in common a respect for language as a means for trans-subjective (and trans-cultural) understanding. It is "verstehen" that distinguishes the logic of social inquiry here and not explanation. Hermeneutics, as the art of "getting inside" the meaning structure of a text, stands not only as a method but as an example of a way of living. However, to adopt hermeneutics is not necessarily to reject any and all empirical approaches (Apel, 1967). It is, though to contextualize them as sources for producing further clarification

of a problem. Nevertheless, a research program based solely on empiricist standards must be rejected, if indeed one is to accept the Wittgensteinian notion of forms of life, of language "games" which require interpretation - and not just description - in order to be meaningful.

Yet an interpretative social science is by itself not completely adequate. This is, in essence, the source of the debate between Gadamer and Habermas (for clear articulations of the respective positions see McCarthy, 1978; and Held, 1980). This is to say that if we respect a certain interest, as Habermas says (1971), in higher principles and values (such as physical and intellectual freedom), then we must also develop a position critical of those conditions which inhibit the full realization of those principles and values. If, for example, the material substructure affects the realization of equality, it is not enough to understand and empathize with the conditions of existence; this understanding must be supplemented with a critical theory which explores the sources of the conditions. Otherwise theory becomes abstracted and barren.

From this perspective, we can appreciate Anyon's (1982:35) three criteria for an adequate social science: that it should be "empirically grounded, theoretically explanatory, and socially critical." The first standard requires not that one begin amassing correlations but that theory itself be concerned with data, avoiding the tendency to develop idealistic generalizations. The second criterion states that a social science should be able to locate the data in a social theory and, the third one, that theory be critical, in the sense of being able to penetrate the surface and analyze the appearances.

A critical theory, then, recognizes that human subjects create and re-create their worlds, and that therefore these worlds need to be understood on their own terms and on levels which are meaningful to the inhabitants. Yet these worlds occur within pre-established structures which themselves are changed or

preserved. Critical theory assumes as an anthropological given (which Habermas (1979), for one, attempts to locate in the constitution of language itself) a human interest in emancipation, an interest thwarted by patterns of structural domination. Further, it adopts a dialectical approach, recognizing the mutability of human arrangements.

The Dominant Perspective

How then does orthodox theory and research measure in relation to the foregoing criteria? Ultimately, they fail because, on the one hand, they cannot account for the means whereby organizational members produce and re-produce meanings and structures and, on the other hand, they cannot assume a critical perspective.

Administrative theory, organizational theory and theories of leadership essentially form a triumverate which addresses the nature of social institutions and our role in their reproduction and governance. The theories supporting and at times directing practical activities with regard to these institutions do not, though, satisfy fully the criteria discussed.

The traditional and dominant mode for viewing organizations, for example, is through an organic analogy and in particular as a "rational, goal-seeking" entity (Penson, 1977; Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

Organizations, in this model, are presumed to be purposive systems, independent of the people in them. A whole host of methodological studies on organizations proceeded from these assumptions, as well as more mundane prescriptions on how to be a rational manager.

The major perspective on administration has also been to see it as rational management and control - involving planning, coordinating, controlling, budgeting, directing and so on.

This legacy can be traced back to Taylorism and the classical administrative position, which remains as much a theoretical focus today as it was decades ago (Gronn, 1982). Scientific management, in particular, developed a managerial bias which separated the (intellectual) labor of management from the (manual) labor of the worker. Horkheimer, (1974:54) comments on the separation of manual from intellectual labor:

The human intellect, which has biological and social origins, is not an absolute entity, isolated and independent. It has been declared to be so only as a result of the social division of labor, in order to justify the latter on the basis of man's natural constitution. The leading functions of production - commanding, planning, organizing - were contrasted as pure intellect to the manual functions of production as lower, impurer form of work, the labor of slaves.

Braverman (1974) has described how Taylorism led to the deskilling of workers, when the totality of the job is broken down into specific functions, and the worker responsible only for that limited skill. The deskilling phenomenon can also apply to education, where, for example, the art of teaching becomes identified with specific skills related to the development of behavioral objectives or the implementation of standardized curricula whose genesis lies in the idea of "teacher-proofing" the school.

Despite the claims of administrative theorists that Taylorism comprises a now-past era in the history of administration, there are a number of indications that Taylorism and its attendant positivistic view of science is happily ensconced within theory. Gronn (1982), for example, has pointed out that several

of the trend-setting studies of administration (e.g., Mintzberg's Nature of Managerial Work 1973) as well as other research into school administration (e.g., Martin & Willower, 1981; Sproull, 1981) show a remarkable preoccupation (to a greater or lesser extent in each) with time and motion studies. These studies, he finds, (1982:2):

...utilize methodologies which, put simply are nothing more or less than latter-day replications of the motion and time studies conducted by F.W. Taylor....the authors' discourses exhibit the same overweening pre-occupation with virtues like 'efficiency'....(and) these accounts seriously misconstrue the phenomenon they purport to explain.

As Watkins (1981:6) puts it: "The principles of Taylorism are still a powerful force in the administration of organizations in both the private and public sectors." Thus, educational administration largely continues to plow the same fields (with, of course, some notable exceptions, e.g., Andrews, 1982; Bates, 1980; Gronn, 1982; Greenfield, 1980; Hodgkinson, 1978;). At the very heart of this issue, and of central importance to why educational administration theorists continue to embrace a problematic paradigm, is a basic disagreement over the nature of administration and its place within the social fabric. Many, if not most of the scholars in the field tend to see administrative studies as a progressive and increasingly sophisticated set of tools which contributes to effective management of a system which remains unquestioned. While admittedly imperfect, it is understood that additional research will provide greater insights into how to steer the system correctly (i.e., according to rationalistic and technical means).

This orientation is also carried into studies on the third part of the triangle, leadership. As a social construct, there is no doubt that leadership

exists. As a theoretical definiendum, leadership remains at best a fuzzy notion: Purrington (1982:22) has suggested that "there is a need to clarify the conceptual and methodological issues" involved in the topic. Dubin (1979), Hall (1982) and Perrow (1979) have similarly been critical of both the conceptual definition and the research methodology. Generally, definitions of leadership draw on one of two disciplines: political science or social psychology. The first model of leadership addresses such issues as coalition formation, inter-group bargaining, power distribution and resource exchange. As Burns (1978:18) addresses it: "...leaders with motives and power bases tap followers' motives in order to realize the purposes of both leaders and followers."

The social psychology model of leadership tends to focus on group processes, with an attendant development of manipulative techniques designed to promote inter-group harmony. Hersey and Blanchard (1972:68) claim that

...most management writers agree that leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation. From this definition of leadership, it follows that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower and other situational variables - $L = F(l, f, s)$. (emphasis in original)

The circularity of this kind of definition doesn't prevent certain leadership theorists from developing and marketing their own leadership training devices (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972; Fiedler, 1967; Blake and Mouton, 1975).

Both models of leadership ultimately fail because in part both adopt voluntaristic constructions of leadership which deny the role of structural factors (such as class position, race and gender, and driving economic forces) in producing and reproducing leaders and leadership. Fiedler, for example, makes a virtue of this lack when he suggests (1967:261) that "Leadership performance

depends then as much upon the organization as it depends upon the leader's own attributes." The social psychological model of leadership in particular ignores any processes exclusive of leader-member relationships and, as Dubin (1979:227) notes "By focusing on leaders' interpersonal relations with followers we have simply chosen a relatively trivial dimension of leadership at a distance."

While we have more sympathy with the political science models, such as coalition - formation (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980), resource allocation (Pfeffer and Salanick, 1978) or political economy (Zald, 1970), they nevertheless fail to analyze the concept of leadership per se (Purrrington, 1982) and, further, neglect any type of critical consciousness. Such models operate within the dominant paradigm and thereby serve largely to reproduce major ideological strategies.

The dominant perspectives on organizations, administration and leadership thus fail to meet in particular the criteria of being socially adequate and critically aware. The dominant perspective, of course, has not gone unchallenged.

Waldo in 1948 critiqued the positivism of public administration theory and Storing in 1962 attacked Simon's idea of value-free administrative science; then organizational theorists, finding the answer to the most rational way to organize eluding them, settled for contingency theory (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967) or, more radically, theories of organizational ambiguity (March & Olsen, 1976), and loose coupling (Weick, 1976). In organizational theory particularly, more and more theorists became concerned about the functionalist model and began working from outside of the paradigm, using inquiry tools acquired from anthropology (Turner, 1971), ethnomethodology (Bittner, 1974; Manning, 1977) and Marxian dialectics (Benson, 1976). Perrow, who has done excellent work in the mainstream tradition, wonders whether indeed these other

approaches have not had more success than the traditional ones (see 1982, and 1979) and himself has moved away from the dominant model. (Owens, a writer on educational administration, places himself squarely in the functionalist model when he writes that "Views such as Perrow expresses cannot be taken seriously until they are documented by expirical evidence derived from vigorous and rigorously designed research" 1981:221).

Yet while there is considerable ferment in organizational theory itself, we suggest that it has not gone far enough in developing a critical approach to organizational structures, administration and leadership.

An Alternative Model: Radical Political Economy

An alternative approach we find more satisfactory for developing social and critical awareness is the development of a radicalized politics of schooling.

The political model, conceptualized in a certain way, can serve to illuminate various structural and cultural factors affecting education. It can also function to provide a more realistic view of educational administration and organization than that which we find in the functionalist paradigm.

The politics of education, however, must be defined more broadly than simply a concern over school board elections and strategies to cope with declining resources. These may certainly be part of the politics of schooling but in themselves depend on a broader definition: politics as the contest over limited resources, involving disparate groups and interests. The resources are social resources which relate to the production, reproduction and distribution of knowledge, of leadership and of culture.

In the first instance, it is a political question to ask "what counts as school knowledge?" As Whitty and Young (1976:7) point out, "the ways in which prevailing conceptions of...(school) subjects represent the world express particular values and interests, both through what they include and exclude and what relations between teachers and pupils they presuppose." In addition, of course, the distribution of quantitative resources to the various disciplines in itself presents a particular political valuation. Administration then becomes a central mechanism in the production and distribution of school knowledge (Bates, 1982).

Secondly, definitions of and opportunities in school leadership reflect political acts. To the degree that leadership is defined as both the source and realization of organizational goals, rather than the practice of political activity resulting in the transformation of social structures, leadership stays unrecognized in its political dimension and thus can become ideological in certain ways.

The very idea of leadership has become a dominant trend in organizational theory. We suspect that the reason for this, despite the inadequacies of the models, is that these views of leadership serve as powerful ideologies which legitimate current organizational structures. They are powerful in the way that the concepts "administration" or "management" are not; in the emotional appeal to greatness and to progress. There is no particular rationality which lies behind class divisions; a supporting ideology of leadership certainly makes those divisions more palatable. It is the labor force, of course, that has "to be 'managed' without either religious or moral props to obeisance" (Giddens, 1981:10); the concept of leadership with its emotion-laden imagery may well substitute. Many of the leadership constructs can be considered, in Willis's words, as a new human relations which "makes a preemptive attempt by management to contain this developing (worker)

consciousness, and utilize it for a greater flexibility and higher motivation" (Willis, 1977: 181). As Hoy and Miskel (1982: 248) observe in their influential text on educational administration, "... leadership is most often exercised when specific task objectives or organizational goals must be accomplished...."; leadership is thus seen as a vehicle for serving unquestioned organizational ends and in this respect may become ideological. The reconceptualization of leadership in terms of the political distribution of cultural and social resources can, however, lead to a recognition of its critically transformative possibilities.

Thirdly, this can lead to our viewing organizations as politically active areas where resource distribution is a primary concern. In this framework, organizations exhibit what Clegg (1981: 550) labels "structure-in-process;" there is, in fact, a structure bounded in time and space and perceived as real by the membership, yet this structure is also being constantly produced and reproduced by the dynamics of control, power and class relationships. The reproduction of the structure that occurs in organizations is a reproduction of rules governing the distribution of resources, rewards and tasks, and it is in this sense that we can view organizations within a political economy model.

A number of scholars have recognized the need for organizations themselves to compete for politically distributed resources. Meyer (1978) and Meyer and Rowan (1977) are partly correct when they point to the school organization as a social institution required to legitimate itself in the political arena by creating an aura of necessity and accomplishment. Both are wrong, however, in attributing the workings of the organization to

"powerful myths" which maintain the role positions of the membership and which perpetuate a "logic of confidence." What is neglected in the formulations here, the institutional school, and in the corresponding "loose-coupling" school, is the organizational presence of power and control. While it is unquestioned that organizations certainly do develop myths and rituals, it is of less certainty that they operate by myth alone. Power and control represent the dynamics of structure maintenance.

Control is established through the rules of the organization, and remains contested. Clegg (1981) tells us that there are a variety of rules at work in the organization: technical rules, exemplified by the writings of Taylor in his efforts to "scientize" management, and socio-regulative rules, oriented towards the socialization of the middle classes into the organizational structure, predominate. In industry generally, technical rules were prominent particularly in the era of the transformation from craft to technology, though remain embodied in work processes today. Socio-regulative rules are aimed more at establishing a normative dimension to the workplace; to, in Clegg's (1981: 553) words, the "reconstruction of social solidarity." Here, the notion of "human resources" begins to replace the one of "human relations," the latter not particularly effective in creating a work force which sees management's needs as its needs.

The analysis of the structure of organizations in terms of the distribution of rules is then in essence a political analysis. The identification of rules designed to control the work force through technical requirements (e.g., how to perform a job to specification) and through normative require-

ments (e.g., the institution of so-called "quality circles") allows us to penetrate to the reality of organizational life: that the distribution of certain resources is to the benefit of certain members of the organization and the rules serve to assure that this distribution is maintained over time and space. The rules, however, serve not only to maintain the integrity of the organizational structure itself but also to promulgate the distribution of societal resources.

In education, then, it has been noted that Taylorism and the efficiency/reform movement were, in the early part of this century, dominant forces in the conduct of schools, with the resultant institutionalization of technical rules regarding attendance, certification, evaluation and so on. Later, it could be argued that socio-regulative rules became added as a means to integrate the school work force into the institutional structure. That is, pay as a motivator was given short shrift when compared to the evolving managerial stress on job satisfaction, participation in decision-making and emphasis on "self-actualization." That, in retrospect, teachers were as interested in the material conditions of their service as in self-actualizing themselves came as a certain shock to managerial psychologists. Teachers, in turn, recognized the political aspects of the organization, even if they did not make the further step of analyzing in detail the distribution of organizational resources.

However, the political economy of schooling more significantly involves the production and reproduction of culture. The study of whose culture is reproduced, and why, is a major administrative question, if we allow for the possibility of leadership as transformative action. Sharp

(1981: 133) has observed that "What happens in schools is not the imposition of a middle-class culture on other groups whose culture is quite alien, but a process of further ideological incorporation of the subordinate classes." This assertion implicates administration, organization and leadership; it raises political questions concerning the organization of education. Willis (1977: 176), for example, has noted that institutions operate on three levels, the official, the programmatic and the cultural. It is the politics of education that studies the interactions between these levels and by virtue of this links the official, administrative level with the unofficial, cultural level. While we develop elaborate ideologies which reflect the official versions of the nature of schooling, we leave unexplored the relationships between the official and programmatic levels and the reproduction of culture, in particular the reproduction of the two classes of intellectual laborers and manual laborers. The question then is how does the administration of organization contribute to the reproduction of class and culture.

An adequate theory of administration (in the context of control over resources) must occur therefore in a broadly based theory of political economy. The normal political economy model, such as discussed by Boyd (1982), holds promise for such areas as analyzing rational action and selection patterns in schooling, but takes as a given the constitution of the organization itself. To be meaningful to the notion of transformation of structures, such a model must be radicalized and thereby take as its subjects the processes of control, knowledge, leadership and cultural distribution.

The political economy model, now based in a radical paradigm, is committed to the concept of social change (see, in this regard, the excellent article by Papagiannis, Klees and Bickel, 1982). If, for example, there is any primary purpose to a political conception of leadership, it is to engage from a theoretical base in transformative action: action which helps us to resolve in some fashion what Weiler (1982) and others have termed a "crisis" in education.

Much of the administrative literature, however, sees the resolution of problems in the educational sphere as only involving the perfection of management techniques. This approach does not address the root issues involved. Much of the politics of schooling literature sees the resolution of problems in the educational sphere as only involving the perfection of the political abilities of administrators. This too, while it may be helpful to some extent in the short run, is not adequate to a basic analysis of schooling.

If we are to study administration and organization from a radicalized perspective, it requires adopting an orientation to empirical, interpretive and critical issues. It has been shown that there are competing and alternative perspectives that can be taken with regard administrative and organizational theory: one based in a functionalist paradigm dependent on empiricist research; the other a radical paradigm which sees the basic issues as lying in the political-economic realities of education. This latter perspective is, we would submit, the more useful one if the idea of praxis as transformative activity is a meaningful one.

Leadership within the Political Economy Framework:

Praxis.

Dominant models of leadership tend to serve as vehicles reifying the intellectual functions of administration and the current structure of organizations. Such models are largely concerned with the integration of others into the pre-established context. However, a radical political economy of schools implies a theory of action (that is, of praxis) if we maintain a classical (as contrasted to a modern) definition of politics. In this conception, politics is differentiated from both 'theory' and 'techne'. Theory was addressed to the interpretation of the immutable; to the very general and consistent aspects of the universe. Techne, however, refers to the development of specific crafts which reflect skills developed over generations and which proved to be useful in some respect. Politics, however, was the search for the just and equal state, the condition of transforming through ethical action conditions which impeded justice and goodness. Here politics is defined as praxis - as transformative action yielding insights into material conditions (Habermas 1972:42).

However, "with the rise of modern science the classical constellation of theoretical, practical, and productive knowledge was drastically altered" (McCarthy 1978:3). Politics, in other words, was scientized and as a science became primarily related to technical problems. Politics in this instance loses its interest in questions of the "good" life in favor of questions of administration and control. Practical questions become indistinguishable from technical questions (Habermas, 1972:255). The science of politics loses its critical function and (absorbed in a quest for value-freedom) concentrates on the analysis of

the objective conditions of system stability. This engagement results in the presentation of cultural and political problems, which in theory are open to rational and public debate, as technical problems requiring only affirmation of solutions posed by experts in political science, systems analysis and so on. Yet the reduction of praxis to technique is never final; cultural issues resist efforts at technical control:

The life-world accomplishes such tasks as the reproduction of cultural norms, the maintenance of social integration, and the socialization of individuals, problems which are by no means resolved by the solution of technical problems of material production (Schmidt, 1982:190).

Leadership as praxis, then, makes an attempt to recognize the various dimensions of, say, the reproduction of culture within schooling, of the patterns of domination that social structures may impose and of the possibility of transformation and transcendence. It resists the reduction of the idea of leadership to technical strategies aimed solely at the furtherance of organizational programs uncritically accepted.

Such leadership accepts the reality of organizational forms, recognizing that organizations reflect a given structure but that that structure is itself constantly reproduced through the activities or acquiescence of the membership. In this case, we see leadership as being intellectual leadership, stripped of the elitist connotations much of the literature on the subject carries. Intellectual leadership is open to all classes, races and genders and is not limited to those politically certified as leaders.

Interpretive Research Within This Framework

Leadership as praxis can in the end become itself a dominating force without adequate interpretive research into the nature of administration,

organizations and leadership. A radicalized model of political economy, which incorporates the ideas concerning administration and leadership expressed here, suggests such directions.

The political economy model offers an interpretation which can stress, in Apple's words (1978:377) "the dialectical relationship between cultural control and distribution and economic and political stratification." This in fact takes political economy one step further than that definition adopted by Boya (1982): public choice leading to the maximization of self-welfare. Such rational action may indeed be operative, and indeed may explain, for example, exit phenomena from public schools, but it must also be contextualized: collective action takes place within a given political and economic structure - one that is both received and produced.

There are two major research directions which can contribute to the understanding of organization, administration and leadership within the context of a political economy. One is the continuation of theoretically based ethnographies of schools. These can yield an exploration of the culture of the organization, and can ground that exploration in a theoretically viable analysis of social culture generally. Of lesser interest here are those studies which concentrate on how school people operate; more attention needs to be paid to what their particular definitions of purpose, content and reality are. One model here which has been quite influential is Paul Willis's Learning to Labour (1977) which, in doing ethnography, also plunges "beneath the surface of ethnography in a more interpretative mode" (p.119). Willis rejects any deterministic definition of culture as caused by structural factors; indeed, he requires that we investigate culture on its own level, as that comes to symbolize the political

and economic structures. Thus, on one level, he provides us with a detailed accounting of the lives and cultures of a group: on another, he relates this material to the wider social sphere in an attempt to account for the development of these particular alternatives, selected out of a wide universe. This type of analysis helps to contextualize and perhaps to explain the developments found in the political economy approach. It yields insights which are theoretically based and critically aware.

Further, even should we not presume to develop full-blown ethnographies, at least one tool we should use more frequently is the case study approach. As an exploratory tool, detailed case studies can - in reference to a politics of schooling - help us to ask the right questions.

A second approach to the study of administration, organization and leadership is the development of biographical accounts of what it means to be an administrator in an organization. The basis for this approach is twofold: on the one hand, we have substantial and substantive accounts of the history and lives of public figures, but contemporary accounts of school administrators are conspicuously absent. On the other hand, such narratives may provide us more insight into the political realities of administration in American society than any number of time and motion studies. Data - deep biographies reflect the lived lives of administrators: they tend to show the underlying emotions, problems and values inherent to this occupation. They stress, as Gronn (1983) has noted, that administration, above all, is engaging in dialogue, in talk, and that other functions flow from this. As a training vehicle, understanding the life of even one excellent administrator in the context of his or her time may be worth any number of aggregate surveys.

Ann and Harold Berlak (1981:234) have noted that there is an assumption in much of the educational research literature that teachers are "something less than knowledgeable, rational and complex in their thinking." They go on (236) to note that:

Many teacher educators contribute to teachers' views of themselves as inferior professionals by their assumption that....teachers need to master the languages and categories of psychology and social science, thus conveying to teachers that the knowledge and concepts of non-teachers is a greater source of wisdom than their own powers of critical inquiry and their practical knowledge gained from experience.

Something of the same ilk operates with respect to administration: I would suggest we have more to learn from administrators than they from us. This is why a deep and contextual narrative may be important. Such an undertaking may well contribute to a theoretically based and critically aware politics of schooling. Models here include Lasswell's work, and that by Davies. Davies (1980:8) has noted that:

...the neglect of the psycho-dynamics of work is extraordinary. What has been done is curiously limited - psychologists, for example, will obligingly find out for headmasters how to point school-leavers towards jobs, or advise business managers on what will make routine workers work harder or more cheerfully, or what will render junior executives more loyal or adaptable. But the actual work of headmasters, managers, and psychologists themselves has been little studied.

Our framework, then, is to develop a theoretical position based in political economy, one which can critique current administrative and organizational arrangements. Complementary to this would be ethnographic or case study efforts which aim themselves at the cultural level in particular, and biographical research efforts intended to humanize the concept of leadership.

Leadership, in this instance, involves the description of the detailed lives of individuals who made a difference in running an organization. The concept endorsed here eschews a generalized "trait" approach, or the identification of particular "styles." What, this approach demands, are the deep intellectual and emotional dimensions to those individuals given positions of authority?; what, indeed, are their dreams and their concerns?

Conclusion

We have briefly sketched a number of concerns that deal with the development of administrative, organizational and leadership research which takes place within the confines of the functionalist paradigm. The assumptions made by that paradigm, we have asserted, preclude it from addressing in any kind of depth the particular criteria of social theorizing and critical awareness.

Alternatively, a politics of schooling, embodying a radical perspective, may be theoretically adequate, critically aware and theoretically rich. A politics of schooling, taken in the broadest sense, can describe administration and organization, yet avoid reifying them nor reducing them to the voluntarism of individuals. It can contribute, in particular, to the development of leadership as praxis. Given that administrators of schools largely if not exclusively learn their jobs by actual practice, by involving themselves in administration, then it might be suggested that a better avenue for research on administration may lie not in telling administrators how to administrate according to some behavioral science model, but by outlining for administrators a social theory which stresses the critical

impact of the school in creating the type of society we live in.] This is "dialogue with the people;" Freire's (1974: 120) vision of praxis and of leadership.

While a politics of schooling is by no means a novel conception, in terms of organizational theory (which has tended to stress the comparative analysis of so-called structural imperatives) and in terms of administration (which has tended to stress the psychology of group management), it has been considered to be of marginal value. (The contention here, however, is that a politics of schooling is indeed central to both administration and organization, and, further, that if the notion of praxis has any relevance to modern life, then that politics of schooling must become radicalized and critical.)

REFERENCES

- Andrews, R. (1982), "Management: Myths and Realities." Paper presented at Australian Council for Educational Administration, Sydney, Australia.
- Anyon, J. (1982), "Adequate Social Science, Curriculum Investigations, and Theory." Theory into Practice 21: 34-37.
- Apel, K-O (1967), Analytic Philosophy of Language and the Geisteswissenschaften. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.
- Apple, M. (1978), "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform." Comparative Education Review 22: 367-387.
- Bacharach, S. and E. Lawler (1980), Power and Politics in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bates, R. (1982), "Towards a Critical Practice of Educational Administration." Paper presented at Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, New York City.
- Bates, R. (1981), "Power and the Educational Administrator: Bureaucracy, Loose Coupling or Cultural Negotiation?" Paper presented at Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.
- Bates, R. (1980), "Educational Administration, the Sociology of Science and the Management of Knowledge." Educational Administration Quarterly 16: 1-20.
- Benson, J.K. (1977a), "Innovation and Crisis in Organizational Analysis." In Organizational Analysis: Critique and Innovation (J.K. Benson, ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage, 5-18.
- Benson, J.K. (1977b), "Organizations: A Dialectical View." Administrative Science Quarterly 18: 3-16.
- Berlak, H. and A. Berlak (1981), Dilemmas of Schooling. London: Methuen.
- Blake, R.B. and J.S. Mouton (1975), "An Overview of the Grid." Training and Development Journal 29: 29-37.
- Bittner, E. (1974), "The Concept of Organization." In Ethnomethodology (R. Turner, ed.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 69-84.
- Boyan, N. (1981), "Follow the Leader: Commentary on Research in Educational Administration." Educational Researcher 10: 6-13.
- Boyd, W. (1982), "The Political Economy of Public Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly 18: 111-130.

- Braverman, H. (1974), Labour and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bridges, E. (1982), "Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967-1980." Educational Administration Quarterly 18: 12-33.
- Burns, J.M. (1978), Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burrell, G. and G. Morgan (1979), Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis. London: Heinemann.
- Clegg, S. (1981), "Organization and Control." Administrative Science Quarterly 26: 545-562.
- Davies, A.F. (1980), Skills, Outlooks and Passions: A Psychoanalytic Contribution to the Study of Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erickson, D. (1979), "Research on Educational Administration: The State of the Art." Educational Researcher 8: 9-14.
- Ericson, D.P. and F.S. Ellett (1982), "Interpretation, Understanding, and Educational Research." Teachers College Record 83: 497-513.
- Dubin, R. (1979), "Metaphors of Leadership." In Crosscurrents in Leadership (J. Hunt and L. Larson, eds.). Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Fiedler, F. (1967), A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freire, P. (1974), Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gadamer, H.G. (1975), Truth and Method. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Giddens, A. (1981), A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979), Central Problems in Social Theory. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1976), New Rules of Sociological Method. New York: Basic Books.
- Greenfield, T.B. (1980), "The Man Who Comes Through the Door in the Wall." Educational Administration Quarterly 16: 26-59.
- Griffiths, D. (1979), "Intellectual Turmoil in Educational Administration." Educational Administration Quarterly 15: 43-65.

- Gronn, P. (1982), "Neo-Taylorism in Educational Administration." Educational Administration Quarterly 18.
- Gronn, P. (1983), "Accomplishing the Doing of School Administration: Talk as the Work." Administrative Science Quarterly, forthcoming.
- Habermas, J. (1979), Communication and the Evolution of Society (T. McCarthy, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1973), Theory and Practice (J. Viertel, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1971), Knowledge and Human Interests (J. Shapiro, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hall, R. (1982), Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Halpin, A.W. and A.E. Hayes (1977), "The Ikon, or, What Ever Happened to Theory?" In Educational Administration: the Developing Decades (L.L. Cunningham, W.G. Hack and R.O. Nystrand, eds.). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Held, D. (1980), Introduction to Critical Theory. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Hersey, P. and K. Blanchard (1972), Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978), Towards a Philosophy of Administration. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Horkheimer, M. (1974), Eclipse of Reason. New York: Seabury Press.
- Hoy, W. and C. Miskel (1982), Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice, 2nd edition. New York: Random House.
- Lasswell, H. (1958), Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. Cleveland: World Publishing Co.
- Lawrence, P.R. and J.W. Lorsch (1967), Organization and Environment. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Manning, P. (1977), "Narcotics Law Enforcement in Two Settings." In Organizational Analysis: Critique and Innovation (J.K. Benson, ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage, 46-63.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J. P. (1976), Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Martin, W.J. and D.J. Willower (1981), "The Managerial Behavior of High School Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly 17: 69-90.

- McCarthy, T. (1978), The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Meyer, J. (1978), "The Effects of Education as an Institution." American Journal of Sociology 84: 55-77.
- Meyer, J. and B. Rowan (1977), "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." American Journal of Sociology 83: 340-363.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973), The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper & Row.
- Morgan, G. (1980), "Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organizational Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly 25: 605-622.
- Owens, R. (1981), Organizational Behavior in Education, 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Papagiannis, G.J., S.J. Klees and R.N. Bickel (1982), "Toward a Political Economy of Educational Innovation." Review of Educational Research 52: 245-290.
- Perrow, C. (1982), "Disintegrating Social Sciences." Phi Delta Kappan 63: 684-688.
- Perrow, C. (1979), Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay, 2nd edition. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- Pfeffer, J. and G.R. Salancik (1978), The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York: Harper & Row.
- Purrrington, G.S. (1982), "Leadership and Politics: Promise or Futility?" Paper presented at Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, New York City.
- Schmidt, J. (1982), "Jürgen Habermas and the Difficulties of Enlightenment." Social Research : 181-208.
- Sergiovanni, T. and F. Carver (1980), The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration, 2nd edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sharp, R. (1980), Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Simon, H. (1965), Administrative Behavior, 2nd edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Sproull, L.S. (1981), "Managing Education Programs: A Micro-Behavioral Analysis." Human Organization 40: 113-122.

- Storing, H.J. (1962), "The Science of Administration: Herbert A. Simon."
In Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics (H.J. Storing, ed.).
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Thompson, J.D. (1967), Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turner, B.A. (1971), Exploring the Industrial Subculture. New York:
Herder and Herder.
- Waldo, D. (1948), The Administrative State. New York: The Roland Press.
- Watkins, P. (1983), "Scientific Management and Critical Theory in
Educational Administration." Unpublished paper, Deakin University,
Australia.
- Weick, K.E. (1976), "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems."
Administrative Science Quarterly 21: 1-21.
- Weiler, H. (1982), "Education, Public Confidence and the Legitimacy of the
Modern State: Do We Have a Crisis?" Phi Delta Kappan 64: 9-14.
- Whitty, G. and M. Young, editors (1976), Explorations in the Politics of
School Knowledge. Nafferton, England: Nafferton Books.
- Willis, P. (1977), Learning to Labour. Hampshire, England: Gower Publishing Co.
- Willower, D.J. (1979a), "Ideology and Science in Organization Theory."
Educational Administration Quarterly 15: 20-42.
- Willower, D.J. (1979b), "Some Issues in Research on School Organizations."
In Problem-Finding in Educational Administration: Trends in Research
and Theory (G.L. Immegart and W.L. Boyd, eds.). Lexington, Mass.:
D.C. Heath, 63-85.
- Zald, M. (1970), "Political Economy: A Framework for Comparative Analysis."
In Power in Organizations (M. Zald, ed.). Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt
Univ. Press.